

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

OCT 23 2006

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

RemarksAmendments to the Claims

The claims have been amended, as indicated above. The amendments to the indicated claims has been presented in accordance with the proposed revisions to 37 C.F.R. §1.121 as set forth in 1267 OG 106 (25 February 2003). No new matter has been introduced through the amending of the claims.

Claim Objections

Claims 19-23 are objected to for various informalities. The claims have been amended, as suggested by the Examiner. Therefore, the Applicant requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the objection.

Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C § 112

Claims 1-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C §112, second paragraph as being indefinite. The Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claims 1-17, 20, and 22-24 have been canceled. With respect to claims 18, 19, and 21, the Applicant contends that the specification provides sufficient support for the phrase "creating a slippage between the sheet and the auxiliary roller nip." As clearly set forth in the specification in paragraphs 12-16, as the sheet of media is being fed by the auxiliary roller nip in one of the directions of Arrows Y, the leading edge of the sheet of media contacts back stop 14 (Figure 1). Once the leading edge of the sheet of media contacts back stop 14, the sheet of media no longer easily slides along lower guide plate 12. This causes a resistance (slippage) in the sheet of media to any further movement along the direction of Arrow A.

Once this happens, rotation slippage device 13 is activated. In this manner, drive roller shaft 11 still rotates along the direction of Arrow Z, but auxiliary drive roller 10 does not rotate. Even though auxiliary drive roller 10 does not rotate at this point in time, the sheet of media is still retained within the auxiliary roller nip. After the